



**STATEMENT BY MR KEN SIAH, COUNSELLOR,
PERMANENT MISSION OF SINGAPORE TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ON AGENDA ITEM 138: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE
APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS,
AT THE MAIN PART OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE FIFTH
COMMITTEE, 5 OCTOBER 2012**

1 Thank you Mr Chairman and congratulations on your election as Chairman of the Fifth Committee. We look forward to working with you and the other members of the bureau during this session. We are confident that under your leadership, the Fifth Committee will achieve consensus on all the important issues facing us at this session.

2 My delegation thanks Mr Bernardo Griever, Chairman of the Committee on Contributions for his presentation of the report contained in document A/67/11. We deeply appreciate the work of the expert members of the Committee. Our thanks also go to Mr Lionelito Berridge, Chief of the Contributions and Policy Coordination Service for introducing the report of the Secretary-General on multi-year payment plans, contained in A/67/75.

Mr Chairman,

3 The Fifth Committee will discuss and adopt the scale of assessments for 2013 to 2015 at this session. It goes without saying that we align ourselves with the statement made by the distinguished representative of Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and China on this agenda item. We would like to make three additional points.

4 One, the current methodology has been used in the last four consecutive scale periods. It is the product of a consensus reached consistently after many rounds of thorough negotiations over twelve years - a consensus which repeatedly recognises the wisdom and practicality of retaining the current methodology. The durability of the methodology is not a mere coincidence. It is an expression of confidence that the methodology adequately reflects the principle of capacity to pay. We do not claim that the scale of assessments is perfect. The apportionment of expenses can never be perfect because each country's idea of a perfect

methodology is different. Furthermore, the apportionment of expenses is a zero-sum. When one country's contribution rate decreases, another country's must increase. The purpose of a practical methodology is to strike a reasonable and workable compromise between different ideal visions of a scale of assessments, while still reflecting the principle of capacity to pay. In this regard, the current methodology has captured changes in the relative economic performances of countries. Countries with relatively stronger economic performances have assumed a greater share of assessments. Those with relatively weaker performances have had their share decrease.

5 Two, the consistent application of the same methodology throughout the last 12 years has allowed the scale to reflect readjustments in a stable and predictable way. My delegation favours preserving this stability by adopting the current methodology for the 2013 to 2015 scale. We oppose proposals which seek to change the elements of the methodology as and when they suit the political purposes of a particular country or group of countries. This would result in a completely unpredictable and impractical system of apportioning this organisation's expenses, one that is based solely on political expediency rather than capacity to pay. Having selected this methodology, there are advantages in maintaining it, even if it does not represent the ideal system for any one country. Let me be clear. The adoption of this methodology would result in a substantial increase in my country's assessments. However, we will accept our commitments so long as they are based on the current methodology which is predicated on a 12 year consensus. We urge all Member States to look beyond cost savings and political gain, and to fulfil their responsibilities to this organisation.

6 Three, my delegation notes that some major contributors seek a change in the methodology of the scale for their own gains. They attempt to transfer greater burden to developing countries while refusing to surrender any of their privileges. My delegation is against any change in methodology which unjustly imposes more obligations on developing countries. Attempts to change the methodology to satisfy a small group of countries' politically-motivated wishes will never be acceptable.

7 In conclusion, I would like to express my delegation's commitment to engage constructively with you and other colleagues in the Fifth Committee on this important agenda item. Thank you Mr Chairman.